

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on April 30, 2008 has been carefully considered. In the Office Action, Claims 12-18 stand rejected and Claims 19-24, 26-28, 30, 31 and 33 are allowed. The Applicants have amended Claim 12. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in light of the amendments above and the remarks below.

Allowed Claims

In the Office Action, Claims 19-24, 26-28, 30, 31 and 33 are allowed.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 12-14 stand rejected as being allegedly unpatentable over Rosenberg (US Patent No. 5,805,140) in view of Tsuchihashi et al. (US Patent No. 4,955,654). The Applicants respectfully traverse.

In determining obviousness four factual inquiries must be looked into in regards to determining obviousness. These are determining the scope and content of the prior art; ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims in issue; resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art; and evaluating evidence of secondary consideration. Graham v. John Deere, 383 U.S. 1 (1966); KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., No 04-1350 (U.S. Apr. 30, 2007) (“ Often, it will be necessary . . . to look into related teachings of multiple patents; the effects of demands known to the design community or present in the marketplace; and the background knowledge possessed by a person having ordinary skill in the art, all in order to determine whether there was an **apparent reason** to combine the known elements in the fashion

claimed by the patent at issue. To facilitate review, this analysis **should be made explicit.**”) (emphasis added).

In determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 U.S.C. 103 is not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious. Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp., 713 F.2d 1530 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Thus, when considering the whole prior art reference its entirety, portions that would lead away from the claimed invention must be considered. W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983), See M.P.E.P. 2141.02. Thus, it is improper to combine references where the references teach away from their combination. In re Grasselli, 713 F.2d 731 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Applicants have amended Claim 12 to recite *inter alia*, the dimension-adjusting mechanism configured to cause the adjustment of the coupling mechanism in response to the peripheral device pushing against the dimension-adjusting mechanism in a direction substantially parallel to the direction of movement of the peripheral device when the peripheral device is engaged by the capture mechanism. The combination of Rosenberg and Tsuchihashi does not teach or suggest this limitation. Instead, Tsuchihashi only teaches that the effector is switched on to close the rotary ring 205 after the operator visually confirms that the shaft 302 has been positioned within the opened portion of the clamping portion 101. (Tsuchihashi, Col. 4, Lines 21-29). In other words, Tsuchihashi does not teach or suggest dimension-adjusting mechanism configured to cause the adjustment of the coupling mechanism in response to the peripheral device pushing against the dimension-adjusting mechanism in a direction substantially parallel to the direction of movement of the peripheral device, as recited in Claim 12.

Accordingly, the combination does not teach or suggest each and every element/limitation in Claim 12. For at least these reasons, Claim 12 is allowable over Rosenberg and Tsuchihashi.

Claims 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Tsuchihashi et al. in view of Rosenberg and in further view of Bailey (US Patent No. 6,062,865). The Applicants respectfully traverse. Claims 13-18 are dependent on independent Claim 12. As stated above, Claim 12 is in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, Claims 13-18 are allowable for being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Conclusion

It is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance and early favorable consideration of this reply is earnestly solicited. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,
THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP

Dated: July 25, 2008

/Suvashis Bhattacharya/
Suvashis Bhattacharya
Reg. No. 46,554

THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax (408) 287-8040